

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

<b>KAMON ROSS,</b>	)
	)
	)
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)
	)
	)
	<b>CIVIL ACTION FILE NO.:</b>
<b>v.</b>	)
	)
	)
<b>HHC PROPERTY I, LLC,</b>	)
	)
	)
<b>Defendant.</b>	)

---

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff KAMON ROSS (“ROSS” or “Plaintiff”) hereby sues Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., (“Defendant”) pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”), and its implementing regulations, the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”) and alleges as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND PARTIES**

1. This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to Title III of the ADA. This Court is vested with original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1333 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon HHC PROPERTY I, LLC.’s, failure to remove physical barriers to equal access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

2. Venue is properly located in the Northern District of Georgia pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs or the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred. The Defendant's property is located in and does business within this judicial district and all events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in this judicial district.

3. Plaintiff, KAMON ROSS, is and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Georgia and is sui juris.

4. Plaintiff is an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA.

5. Plaintiff is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, reaching and grasping.

6. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

7. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a "tester" for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff's civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. Plaintiff's motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make areas that the he frequents more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so

an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on the Subject Property, including returning to the Subject Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).

8. Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., is a domestic limited liability company registered to do business and, in fact, is conducting business in the State of Georgia and within this judicial district.

9. Defendant can be served with process via its Registered Agent, Patti E Harmon, 289 Washington Ave NE Marietta, GA 30060.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10. In June of 2020, Plaintiff attempted to but was deterred from patronizing, and/or gaining equal access as a disabled patron to the subject strip shopping center located at 4712 Memorial Drive, Decatur, GA 30032.

11. HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., is the owner, lessor, and/or operator/lessee of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action, specifically the subject strip shopping center and its attendant facilities, including common vehicular parking and common exterior paths of travel within the site identified by the DeKalb County Property Tax Assessor’s parcel identification number 18 012 02 014 (“Subject Facility”, “Subject Property”).

12. Plaintiff resides within five (5) miles of the Subject Property.

13. Because the Subject Property is in the vicinity of the Plaintiff's residence, he is routinely in the area where the Subject Property is located and travels in and about this area numerous times each month.

14. Plaintiff's access to the Subject Property and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Subject Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

15. Plaintiff has visited the Subject Property at least once before as a patron and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Subject Property within six months of the filing of this Complaint or sooner, as soon as the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed. The purpose of the revisit is to be a regular patron, to determine if and when the Subject Property is made accessible, and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

16. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Subject Property as a regular patron to enjoy the same experiences, goods, and services available to Defendant's non-disabled patrons as well as for Advocacy Purposes, but does not intend to continue

to repeatedly re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to equal access and engage in the futile gesture of attempting to patronize the Subject Property, a business of public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to equal access for wheelchair users.

17. Plaintiff recently traveled to the Subject Property as a patron and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered and/or observed the barriers to access that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers where physically possible, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to equal access present at the Subject Property.

**COUNT I – CLAIM FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
**(Against Defendant for ADA Violations)**

18. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

19. The Subject Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

20. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

21. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

22. The Subject Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and the ADAAG.

23. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Subject Property in his capacity as a patron at the Subject Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to equal access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Subject Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Subject Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

24. Plaintiff intends to visit the Subject Property again in the very near future as a patron and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered to able-bodied patrons of the Subject Property but will be unable

to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Subject Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Subject Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

25. Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Subject Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

26. Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Subject Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Subject Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

27. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Subject Property and the Subject Property and the

full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Subject Property include, but are not limited to:

#### ACCESSIBLE PARKING

- a. The two (2) designated accessible parking spaces are not level and have areas of uneven and broken pavement because of Defendant's practice of failing to maintain the accessible parking surface in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211, Sections 4.5.1 and 4.6.3 of the 1991 ADAAG and Sections 302 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation made it dangerous for Plaintiff to utilize the parking facility at the Subject Property and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- b. The access aisle serving the designated van accessible parking space on the north end of the parking facility is not level and has areas of uneven and broken pavement because of Defendant's practice of failing to maintain the access aisle surface in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211, Sections 4.5.1 and 4.6.3 of the 1991 ADAAG and Sections 302 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation made it dangerous for Plaintiff to utilize the parking facility at the Subject Property and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- c. The accessible parking space on the south end of the parking facility has no access aisle in violation of Section 4.6 of the 1991 ADAAG and Sections 208 and 502 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation made it dangerous for Plaintiff to utilize the parking facility at the Subject Property and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

- d. The accessible parking space on the south end of the parking facility has no visible upright signage (signage appears to be missing or removed) in violation of Section 4.6 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 502 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation made it dangerous for Plaintiff to utilize the parking facility at the Subject Property and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

#### ACCESSIBLE ROUTES/RAMPS

- e. The available paths of travel from the designated accessible parking spaces to the tenant space entrances are inaccessible to wheelchair users due to unpermitted slopes and/or changes in level in violation of Section 4.5.2 of the 1991 ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303 and 304 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- f. The transition at the bottom of the built-up curb ramp from the parking facility to the storefront curb and tenant space entrances is unbeveled with abrupt vertical changes in level which exceed  $\frac{1}{4}$  inches in violation of Sections 4.3 and 4.5.2 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 403 of the 2010 ADAAG and said accessible features are not being maintained by Defendant in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211. These violations prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- g. The built-up curb ramp from the parking facility to the storefront curb and tenant space entrances has a run which exceeds the maximum slope requirement

(8.33%) set forth in Section 4.7.2 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 406.1 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

- h. The pedestrian route on the storefront curb of the Subject Property between the Walk-in Weaves tenant space and the Emmanuel's Hair Braiding tenant space has a slope in excess of 1:20, a total rise greater than six (6) inches, as such it is considered a ramp and subject to the requirements for accessible ramps yet has a handrail that fails to meet the basic minimum requirements set forth for handrails in Section 4.26 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG. This is a violation of Section 4.8.5 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- i. The pedestrian route on the storefront curb of the Subject Property between the Walk-in Weaves tenant space and the Emmanuel's Hair Braiding tenant space has a slope in excess of 1:20, a total rise greater than six (6) inches, and as such is considered a ramp and subject to the requirements for accessible ramps yet has a running slope which exceeds the maximum slope requirement (8.33%) set forth in Section 4.7.2 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 406.1 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.
- j. The pedestrian route on the storefront curb of the Subject Property between the Emmanuel's Hair Braiding tenant space and the A-1 Driving School tenant space has a slope in excess of 1:20, a total rise

greater than six (6) inches, as such it is considered a ramp and subject to the requirements for accessible ramps yet has a handrail that fails to meet the basic minimum requirements set forth for handrails in Section 4.26 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG. This is a violation of Section 4.8.5 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

- k. The pedestrian route on the storefront curb of the Subject Property between the Emmanuel's Hair Braiding tenant space and the A-1 Driving School tenant space has a slope in excess of 1:20, a total rise greater than six (6) inches, as such it is considered a ramp and subject to the requirements for accessible ramps yet has a running slope which exceeds the maximum slope requirement (8.33%) set forth in Section 4.7.2 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 406.1 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented safe access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

#### TENANT SPACE ENTRANCES

1. The paved areas of the storefront curb immediately outside the accessible entrances to the tenant spaces has unlevel approach that extends into the minimum level maneuvering clearance required for a wheelchair user to approach and access each entrance's outward swinging entry door in violation of Section 4.13.6 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 404.2.4.1 of the 2010 ADAAG. This violation prevented equal access to the

plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

m. One or more of the accessible entrances to the tenant spaces at the subject facility have a door closer that closes too quickly. Violation: The sweep speed settings of the door closers for the accessible entrance doors have not been maintained properly by Defendant which has caused the door closing speeds to increase with time and use so that the time allowed to transition the door, from an open position of 90 degrees to a position of 12 degrees from the latch, is too brief to allow individuals with mobility impairments to enter and/or exit safely, independently and/or without difficulty, in violation of Section 4.13.10 of the 1991 ADAAG and Section 404.2.8 of the 2010 ADAAG. This accessible feature is not being maintained by Defendant in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211. These violations prevented equal access to the plaintiff and caused Plaintiff undue upset and loss of opportunity.

#### MAINTENANCE PRACTICES

- n. Defendant has a practice of failing to maintain the accessible features of the facility, creating barriers to access for the Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211. This practice prevented access to the plaintiff equal to that of Defendant's able-bodied customers causing Plaintiff loss of opportunity, anxiety, humiliation and/or embarrassment.
- o. Defendant has a practice of failing to maintain the accessible elements at the Subject Facility by neglecting its continuing duty to discover transient accessible elements which by the nature of their design

or placement, frequency of usage, exposure to weather and/or other factors, are prone to shift from compliant to noncompliant so that said elements may be discovered and remediated. Defendant failed and continues to fail to alter its inadequate maintenance practices to prevent future recurrence of noncompliance with dynamic accessible elements at the Subject Facility in violation of 28 CFR § 36.211, the 1991 ADAAG, and the 2010 ADAAG. These violations, as set forth hereinabove, made it impossible for Plaintiff to experience the same access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Subject Facility as Defendant's able-bodied patrons and caused Plaintiff loss of opportunity, anxiety, embarrassment and/or humiliation.

p. Defendant has failed to modify its discriminatory maintenance practices to ensure that, pursuant to its continuing duty under the ADA, the Subject Property remains readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals, including Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR § 36.302 and 36.211. This failure by Defendant prevented access to the plaintiff equal to that of Defendant's able-bodied customers causing Plaintiff loss of opportunity, anxiety, humiliation and/or embarrassment.

28. The discriminatory violations described above are not an exhaustive list of the Defendant's current barriers to equal access and violations of the ADA because Plaintiff was unable to access and assess all areas of the subject premises due to the architectural barriers encountered. A complete list of the Subject

Property's ADA violations affecting the Plaintiff as a wheelchair user, and the remedial measures necessary to remove same, will require an on-site inspection by Plaintiff's representatives pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34. Once the Plaintiff personally encounters discrimination, as alleged above, or learns of discriminatory violations through expert findings of personal observation, he has actual notice that the defendant does not intend to comply with the ADA.

29. The defendant has a practice of failing to maintain the accessible elements at the Subject Property by neglecting its continuing duty to review, inspect, and discover transient accessible elements which by the nature of their design or placement, frequency of usage, exposure to weather and/or other factors, are prone to shift from compliant to noncompliant, so that said elements are discovered and remediated. Defendant failed and continues to fail to alter its inadequate maintenance practices to prevent future recurrence of noncompliance with dynamic accessible elements at the Subject Property in violation of 28 CFR §§ 36.202 and 36.211. These violations, as referenced hereinabove, made it impossible for Plaintiff, as a wheelchair user, to experience the same access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Subject Property as Defendant's able-bodied patrons.

30. Accessible elements at the Subject Property have been altered and/or

constructed since 2010.

31. The foregoing violations are violations of the 1991 ADAAG, and the 2010 ADAAG, as adopted by the U.S. Department of Justice. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

32. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

33. Each of the violations alleged herein is readily achievable to modify to bring the Subject Property into compliance with the ADA.

34. Removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Subject Property is readily achievable because of the site conditions at the Subject Property, the structural design of the subject facility, and the straightforward nature of the necessary modifications.

35. To assist businesses in offsetting the costs associated with complying with the ADA and removing barriers to access for individuals with disabilities, Section 44 of the IRS Code provides a tax credit for small business owners, and

Section 190 of the IRS Code provides a tax deduction for all business owners, including the Defendant.

36. Removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions at the Subject Property is readily achievable because of the relative low cost of the necessary modifications and the Defendant has the financial resources to make the modifications, including the financial assistance made available to Defendant by the government pursuant to Section 44 and/or Section 190 of the IRS Code.

37. By continuing to maintain and/or operate the Subject Property with discriminatory conditions in violation of the ADA, Defendant contributes to Plaintiff's sense of isolation and segregation and deprives Plaintiff of the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations available to able bodied individuals of the general public.

38. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for its places of public accommodation that have existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); additionally, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including people who use

wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facilities were designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facilities must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA. To date, Defendant has failed to comply with this mandate.

39. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Subject Property, including those alleged herein. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted.

40. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

41. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of litigation from Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188, 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505. Plaintiff will be denied full and equal access to the subject premises, as provided by the ADA unless the injunctive relief requested herein is granted.

42. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is vested with the authority to grant Plaintiff injunctive relief; including an Order to alter the subject facilities to

make them readily accessible to, and useable by, individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA, and closing the subject facilities until the requisite modifications are completed, and ordering Defendant to fulfill its continuing duty to maintain the accessible features at the premises in the future as mandated by 28 CFR 36.211.

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff prays as follows:

- A. That the Court find Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- B. That the Court enter an Order requiring Defendant, HHC PROPERTY I, LLC., to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the Subject Property to make the subject property readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the full extent required by Title III of the ADA;
- C. That the Court enter an Order directing Defendant, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 36.211, to fulfill its continuing duty to maintain and repair its accessible features and equipment in the future so that the facility remains accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities in the future, to the full extent required by Title III of the ADA;
- D. That the Court enter an Order directing Defendant to implement and carry out effective policies, practices, and procedures to maintain and repair its accessible features and equipment in the future pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 36.302 and 28 C.F.R. § 36.211.
- E. That the Court enter an Order directing Defendant to evaluate and neutralize its policies and procedures towards

persons with disabilities for such reasonable time so as to allow them to undertake and complete corrective procedures;

- F. An award of attorneys' fees, costs (including expert fees), and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205;
- G. An award of interest upon the original sums of said award of attorney's fees, costs (including expert fees), and other expenses of suit; and
- H. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Respectfully submitted, this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of January 2021.

/s/ Meredith J. Carter  
Meredith J. Carter  
Georgia Bar No.: 325422

M. CARTER LAW LLC  
2690 Cobb Parkway SE  
Suite A5-294  
Smyrna, GA 30080  
Tel: (404) 618-3838  
meredith@mcarterlaw.com